

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Applicants have amended Figures 2-4 to correct clerical and/or typographical errors, and as such, Applicants have attached replacement sheets for Figures 2-4 in accordance with 37 C.F.R.

1.121(d). These amendments do not add new matter.

In Figure 2, Applicants have amended the lead line extending from reference numeral 203, such that reference numeral 203 now correctly identifies delay 203, as opposed to best sample selector 210.

In Figure 3, Applicants have amended the lead line extending from reference numeral 308, such that reference numeral 308 now correctly identifies noise filter 308. Further, Applicants have corrected the reference numeral identifying delay circuit 316 by changing it from “308” to “316.”

In Figure 4, Applicants have amended the lead line extending from reference numeral 308, such that reference numeral 308 now correctly identifies noise filter 308. Further, Applicants have corrected the reference numeral identifying delay circuit 316 by changing it from “308” to “316.”

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed July 24, 2007, the Examiner (1) rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and (2) objected to claims 4, 10, and 17 as being dependant upon a rejected base claim while indicating that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 4, 10, and 17 include allowable subject matter.

Claims 4, 10, and 17, which include allowable subject matter, each recite that a frequency offset between an oscillator in the DPSK receiver and an oscillator in the DPSK transmitter is determined by comparing the in-phase and quadrature components of an input signal with a second delayed, conjugated version of the in-phase and quadrature components of the input signal that is delayed by approximately one sample interval. Applicants have now amended claims 1, 8, and 15 to incorporate this allowable subject matter. Applicants have also canceled claim 4 for antecedent basis reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 15 as written are in condition for allowance. Further, because claims 2-3, 9-14, and 16-21 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 9-14, and 16-21 are also in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative below if any questions arise or he may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 24, 2007

By: /Rory P. Shea/  
Rory P. Shea  
Reg. No. 60,529  
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6709  
312 913 3337  
shea@mbhb.com